

# **Arkansas State Plan for Agricultural Services**

## **Program Year 2000**

### **I. Summary of Submission Requirements**

In program year 2000 (PY 00), the Arkansas Employment Security Department (AESD) will continue to provide services to migrant seasonal farm workers (MSFWs) that are qualitatively equivalent and quantitatively proportionate to services provided to non-MSFWs, in accordance with regulations at 20 CFR 653, Subpart B.

Arkansas does not have a significant number of home-based- migrants but serves as a conduit for Texas-based- migrants in transit to the Great Lakes, Northeast, and the Southeast regions of the United States in search of employment. During calendar year 1999, the Hope Migrant Center registered 37,854 MSFWs. Arkansas is not a significant MSFW state and it does not have a significant MSFW local office.

Throughout the Hope Migrant center's 50 year history, annual registrations have fluctuated periodically for various reasons; weather, crop conditions, housing shortages, etc. Registrations have ranged from 1,119 in 1959 to 56,513 in 1973, and we can expect that trend to continue whenever uncontrollable circumstances arise. For the past 14 years annual registrations have averaged approximately, 35,500 with 36,125 recorded for 1999.

For the migrant families convenience, the Hope Migrant Mission Center's services are provided by three organizations; the Arkansas Baptist State Convention, the Southwest Arkansas Baptist Association, and the North American Mission Board, SBC.

The mission employs one full-time Director to administer services along with numerous volunteers. Families receive a distribution of Hunger Relief Funds and supplies used for Health Kits donated by individuals and volunteers.

During PY 00, our major focus will be to locate MSFWs living in the state and inform them of services which are available through the ESD; to enhance working relationships and improve conditions for migrant workers through cooperation and coordination with the Arkansas Human Development Corporation (402 Operator), Arkansas Department of Labor Wage and Hour Division, Arkansas Land and Farm Development Corporation, Migrant Education, Cooperative Extension Service and other agriculturally involved organizations; to increase correlation of agricultural employers who need workers and agricultural workers who are in need of a job; to enhance the supportive service network for MSFWs who are in need of assistance to reach work sites or return home.

### **A. Assessment of Need**

(See Part II)

## **B. Outreach Activities**

(See Part III)

## **C. Wagner- Peyser Act Services Provided to MSFWs through the One-Stop Delivery System**

(See Part IV)

## **D. Wagner- Peyser Act Services Provided to Agricultural Employers through the One-Stop Delivery System.**

(See Part V)

## **E. Other Requirements**

### **1. Status of MSFW Monitor Advocate.**

Arkansas is not a MSFW Significant State. Therefore, it is not a requirement to appoint a full-time MSFW Monitor Advocate.

### **2. State Monitor Advocate Approval/Comments**

The state Monitor Advocate has been afforded an opportunity to review and comment on the Wagner-Peyser Plan of Service to be delivered by the Arkansas Employment Security Department for Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers.

### **3. Consideration of Previous Year's Annual MSFW Monitor Advocate Report**

In preparation of this plan, consideration was given to the 1999 Monitor Advocate recommendations as presented in the annual MSFW summary.

### **4. MSFW Affirmative Action Review/Comments.**

Arkansas is not a MSFW Significant State. Therefore, no Affirmative Action Plan is required.

### **5. WIA Section 167/JTPA 402 Review/Comments**

The state Agricultural Service Plan has been reviewed by the WIA Section 402 Program Operator.

## II. Assessment of Need

### A. Review of the PY 1999 Agricultural Activity in Arkansas

The following are labor intensive crops:

Crops	Estimated Acres Harvested PY 99	PY 00	Duration of Harvest	Geographic Area/ County	Estimated Workers PY 99	# of PY 00
Apples	2,470	2,800	Aug. 15 Oct. 1	St. Francis Cross Johnson	800	850
Grapes	2,265	2,500	July 15 Aug 1	Pope	755	760
Tomatoes	1,600	1,900	June 15 July 22	Bradley Drew	1,500	1,550
Strawberries	240	270	Apr 17 May 17	White	300	375
Blueberries	645	700	June 1 July 15	Washingt on Johnson Franklin Madison	765	800
Peaches	2,935	1,980	June 25 July 30	St. Francis Cross Howard Johnson	1,200	1,400

Apples and Blueberries crops were down in 1999. The major crop for which alien workers were used to address labor shortages was tomatoes.

### B. A review of PY 1999 MSFWs Activities in Arkansas (See the Chart II. A., above.)

During PY 99, AESD received 356 job orders which represented 1,443 agricultural job openings. Of this number, 649 were filled. There were 607 individuals placed in agricultural employment.

The farms in Arkansas are highly mechanized and very few require a significant number of manual laborers. Although Arkansas has a relatively large number of farm workers, many of them are job attached and work year after year for the same employers. They are usually on lay-off during the winter months and return to work in the spring.

### **C. Projected Level of Agricultural Activity in PY 99**

For the projected level of agricultural activity in PY 99, see Chart II.A. above.

### **D. Projected Number of MSFWs in PY 99**

For the projected number of MSFWs in PY 99, see Chart II. A. above.

## **III. Outreach Activities**

### **A. Assessment of Available Resources**

#### **1. State Agency Staff Positions Assigned to Outreach Activities**

To the extent possible, the Monitor Advocate, AESD local office managers, employment service supervisors, and Arkansas Human Development Corporation (AHDC) staff will contact MSFWs personally. AHDC staff will contact MSFWs in their homes or living areas and their gathering places and to the extent possible, follow-up visits will be made. In addition to personal contacts by designated outreach staff, AESD will publicize employment service programs through state and local newspapers, public service announcements and talk shows on radio and television, as well as through the distribution of posters, brochures, videotapes, and slides.

#### **2. Number of State Agency Staff Positions Assigned to Outreach Activities**

AESD does not have sufficient funds to assign a permanent staff person to perform outreach activities, but other AESD staff will continue to provide outreach services to Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers and coordinate outreach activities during PY 2000.

#### **3. Resources Made Available Through Existing Cooperative Agreements**

AESD has a cooperative agreement with the Arkansas Human Development Corporation (AHDC), 402 program operator. During PY 99 there were 2,859 outreach contacts made with MSFWs through AHDC. These contacts required 209 staff days. During PY 00, an estimated 3,200 contacts will be made by AHDC on behalf of AESD. Approximately 225 staff days will be required.

AESD plans to participate in meetings with AHDC, the Cooperative Extension Service, growers, workers, and other entities to address labor shortage problems. The purpose of these meetings will be to create a better understanding of the problems faced by farmers and farm workers, increase coordination among all concerned parties, create new avenues for outreach, disseminate vital information to all concerned parties, and provide a forum for discussion and problem solving related to compliance.

AESD staff will participate in meetings and workshops, make presentations, and contact agricultural associations, the Cooperative Extension Service, the Farm Bureau, and other farm organizations to inform them of services available through AESD. AESD will also request that these agencies share this information with farmers during their contacts with them. AESD will coordinate activities with the migrant education program to locate and inform additional migrants about the employment services available to them.

## **B. Numerical Goals**

### **1. AESD Staff Contacts to MSFWs**

AESD does not have outreach staff assigned to its Local offices and will use available staff to provide outreach services.

### **2. AESD Staff Days for Outreach**

Not applicable. AESD does not have outreach staff assigned for this purpose.

### **3. Other Agencies' MSFW Contacts**

AESD plans to improve PY 99 contacts from 2,859 to approximately 3,200 for PY 2000. An agreement has been developed and executed between Arkansas Human Development and AESD to contact MSFWs. AHDC will continue to contact MSFWs personally.

## **C. Proposed Outreach Activities**

No permanent Employment Service staff are assigned to local offices to provide outreach services. AESD has an agreement with AHDC to assist AESD in outreach activities.

## **IV. Wagner-Peyser Act Services Provided to MSFWs through the One-Stop Delivery System.**

### **A. Planning data for the upcoming year**

The estimated plan data for the current year do not indicate difficulty in meeting any of the criteria explained in this section.

- a. Not applicable
- b. Not applicable
- c. Not applicable

Coordination between AESD staff and service providers within the one-stop centers will be implemented to ensure quality service to all MSFWs. AESD staff will provide a full range of service to MSFWs on a basis that is qualitatively equivalent and quantitatively proportionate to services provided to non-MSFWs.

AESD staff will determine services to be provided to MSFWs. Some of the services being provided through one-stop centers are referrals to jobs, training, supportive services, full applications, job search, career planning, outreach, counseling and testing. AESD will develop customer orientations on using electronic self-assistance tools in resource centers. AESD will continue to provide one-on one service to MSFWs when needed to ensure equity in the delivery of services.

Arkansas expect to meet at least four of the five MSFW service equity indicators. The counseling indicator is the possible exception. Due to decreased funding levels and the elimination of trained counselors in the local offices, AESD is not able to assure a significant amount of counseling. AESD believes that by using veteran representatives with counseling experience in the local offices to identify MSFW veterans, it will make an improvement in the level of counseling effort to MSFWs. This also will increase the other four indicators- MSFWs referred to jobs, MSFWs for whom service is provided, MSFWs referred to supportive services, and MSFWs for whom a job development contact is made.

Following are actual and planned services to Migrant and Seasonal Farm workers.

	Actual PY 99	P lanned PY 00	Planned PY 01
Total New Applicants and Renewals	84	98	100
Referred to Jobs	34	45	50
Some Service Provided	84	98	100
Referred to Supportive Service	6	6	8
Completed Applications	84	98	100
Counseled	0	1	2
Job Development	2	3	4

For the five equity indicators in 1999, the ratios between MSFWs and non- MSFWs were as follows:

	MSFW	Non-MSFWs
Referred to Jobs	64%	59%
Some Services Provided	100%	56%
Referred to Supportive Services	9%	7%
Counseled	0%	0%
Job Development	2%	3%

#### **B. Significant MSFW Local Office Affirmative Action Plans.**

Not applicable since Arkansas is not a Significant State.

## V. Wagner-Peyser Act Services Provided to Agricultural Employers through the One-Stop Delivery System.

### A. Data Analysis

Actual and Planned Services to Agricultural Employers

	ACTUAL PY 99	PLANNED PY 00	PLANNED PY 01
<b>TOTAL ORDERS</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>450</b>
<b>a. Openings</b>	<b>1,443</b>	<b>1,500</b>	<b>1,700</b>
<b>b. Referrals</b>	<b>1,939</b>	<b>2,000</b>	<b>2,400</b>
<b>c. Filled</b>	<b>649</b>	<b>675</b>	<b>700</b>
<b>% of openings filled</b>		<b>44%</b>	<b>45%</b>
<b>d. Interstate orders received</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>e. Interstate orders initiated</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>30</b>
	ACTUAL	PLANNED	
PLANNED PY 01		PY 99	PY 00
<b>NON- H-2A INTERSTATE ORDERS</b>			
<b>a. Openings</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>b. Referrals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>c. Filled</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>% of openings filled</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>H-2A INTERSTATE ORDERS</b>			
<b>a. Openings</b>	<b>816</b>	<b>850</b>	<b>900</b>
<b>b. Referrals</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>200</b>
<b>c. Filled</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>% of openings filled</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### B. Narrative Description

AESD will provide agricultural employers with applicants who meet the job- related selection criteria established by the employers. This year's employers; to increase the percentage of agricultural openings filled; to enhance employer/worker job match through the interstate clearance process.

AESD will participate in meetings and conferences of agricultural employers and inform them of employment services and the agricultural recruitment system. AESD will coordinate activities with the 402 program operator; State and Federal Departments of Labor, Wage and Hour, OSHA, Migrant Education, and other organizations to gain and share information which should enhance AESD's ability to more effectively provide technical assistance to employers.

The AESD Employment Service staff will promote services to agricultural employers by using the computer terminal at the Hope Migrant Center and participating in meetings and conferences and informing them of available services.

The Employment Service will continue to inform employers of the interstate clearance system and to coordinate with Texas and other supply states to obtain qualified workers with U.S. citizenship.

To provide for an effective labor exchange service delivery system for agricultural communities across the state, the Monitor Advocate will develop strategies to enhance and measure employment services provided through one-stop centers. Activities will include assessing the needs of agricultural employers and job seekers, providing outreach services to inform customers of services being provided through one-stop centers, and developing customer orientations on the use of electronic self- assistance tools in the one-stop resource centers.

## **VI. Enclosures**

Table 1. Significant MSFW States

Table 2. Significant MSFW Local Offices Affirmative Action Plan

Table 3. Minimum Service Level Indicators

Table 4. Significant Local Offices and Bilingual Offices, by Region

Table 5. States with the Highest Estimated Year-Round Activities

Table 1

**SIGNIFICANT MSFW STATES FOR PY 2000**

<u>State</u>	<u>MSFW Applicants</u>
1. California	44,347
2. Texas	30,991
3. Florida	20,404
4. Washington	20,260
5. North Carolina	12,729
6. Arizona	8,401
7. Georgia	7,006
8. Michigan	6,958
9. Puerto Rico	6,840
10. South Carolina	4,559
11. Virginia	3,860
12. Oregon	3,207
13. Minnesota	2,582
14. New Mexico	2,270
15. Ohio	2,207
16. Indiana	2,117
17. Idaho	1,794
18. Colorado	1,327
19. New York	1,326
20. Wisconsin	1,001

Table 2

**AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLAN SIGNIFICANT MSFW LOCAL OFFICES  
(TOP 20% OF MSFW ACTIVITY NATIONWIDE)**

<u>Local Office</u>	<u>Region</u>	<u>MSFW Applications</u>
McAllen, TX	VI	10,155
Edinburg, TX	VI	5,841
Weslaco, TX	VI	5,778
Yuma, AZ	IX	6,741
Sanger, CA	IX	3,315
Sunnyside, WA	X	4,113
Moses Lake, WA	X	<u>3,662</u>

Total MSFW Applications: 39,605

Federal regulations at 20 CFR 653.111(b)(1) require that "Affirmative Action Plan" local offices be designated each year. For purposes of this provision, these local offices mean those representing the top 20% of MSFW activity nationally.

Total MSFW applications nationwide in PY 1998 = 188,727

$188,727 \times 20\% = 37,745$

Table 3

**MINIMUM SERVICE LEVEL INDICATORS FOR PY 2000**

In accordance with federal regulations at 20 CFR 653.112, the following are the services and minimum levels that significant MSFW States are to meet in providing services to MSFWs:

- (1) Individuals placed in a job;
- (2) Individuals placed in a job with a wage exceeding the federal minimum wage by at least 50 cents/hour;
- (3) Placed in long-term (over 150 days) non-agricultural jobs;

<u>State</u>	<u>(1)</u> <u>MSFW</u> <u>Placed %</u>	<u>(2)</u> <u>Placed \$.50</u> <u>Above Federal</u> <u>Minimum Wage</u>	<u>(3)</u> <u>Placed In</u> <u>Long-term</u> <u>Non-Ag Job</u>
California	42.5	14.0%	4.9%
Texas	42.5	14.0	8.2
Florida	42.5	14.0	6.0
Washington	42.5	14.0	3.3
North Carolina	42.5	14.0	5.0
Arizona	42.5	14.0	3.8
Georgia	42.5	14.0	3.8
Michigan	42.5	14.0	4.2
Puerto Rico	42.5	14.0	3.0
South Carolina	42.5	14.0	6.2
Virginia	42.5	14.0	5.0
Oregon	42.5	14.0	3.9
Minnesota	42.5	14.0	5.2
New Mexico	42.5	14.0	4.3
Ohio	42.5	14.0	7.3
Indiana	42.5	14.0	3.0
Idaho	42.5	14.0	4.0
Colorado	42.5	14.0	6.5
New York	42.5	14.0	3.3
Wisconsin	42.5	14.0	4.5

- (4) Review of significant MSFW local offices: 100% for all significant States

The determination for the following were established by the States commencing with PY 1996:

- (5) Field checks on agricultural clearance orders;
- (6) Outreach contacts per staff day; and
- (7) Processing of complaints.

Table 4

**SIGNIFICANT MSFW LOCAL OFFICES AND BILINGUAL OFFICES  
BY REGION FOR PY 2000**

<b><u>REGION I</u></b>	<b>West Virginia</b>	<b>Kingstree*</b>
<b>NONE</b>	<b>Martinsburg</b>	<b>Spartanburg*</b>
		<b>Sumter*</b>
<b><u>REGION II</u></b>	<b><u>REGION IV</u></b>	<b><u>REGION V</u></b>
<b>Puerto Rico</b>	<b>Florida</b>	<b>Illinois</b>
<b>Aguadilla</b>	<b>Apopka*</b>	<b>Danville*</b>
<b>Arecibo/Manati</b>	<b>Apollo Beach*</b>	<b>Kankakee*</b>
<b>Bayamon</b>	<b>Belle Glade*</b>	<b>Murphysboro*</b>
<b>Caguas</b>	<b>Bradenton*</b>	<b>Peoria*</b>
<b>Guayama</b>	<b>Fort Pierce*</b>	
<b>Humacao</b>	<b>Homestead*</b>	<b>Michigan</b>
<b>Mayaguez/San German</b>	<b>Immokalee*</b>	<b>Sidney*</b>
<b>Ponce/Coamo/Yauco</b>	<b>Naples*</b>	
<b>Rio Piedras</b>	<b>Plant City*</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>
<b>Yanco</b>	<b>Quincy*</b>	<b>Albert Lea*</b>
<b>New York</b>	<b>Sebring*</b>	<b>Crookston*</b>
<b>Albion/Elba*</b>	<b>Wauchula*</b>	<b>East Grand Forks*</b>
<b>Hudson*</b>	<b>Winterhaven*</b>	<b>Fergus Falls*</b>
<b>Kingston*</b>		<b>Mankato*</b>
<b>Lockport*</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	<b>Moorhead*</b>
<b>Newark*</b>	<b>Americus*</b>	<b>Owatonna*</b>
<b>Pine Island*</b>	<b>Bainbridge*</b>	<b>Willmar*</b>
<b>Riverhead*</b>	<b>Cordale*</b>	
	<b>Douglas*</b>	<b>Ohio</b>
<b>New Jersey</b>	<b>Moultrie*</b>	<b>Fremont*</b>
<b>Hammononton*</b>	<b>Statesboro*</b>	
<b>Vineland/Bridgetown*</b>	<b>Vidalia*</b>	<b>Wisconsin</b>
<b><u>REGION III</u></b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	<b>Beaver Dam*</b>
<b>Delaware</b>	<b>Clinton*</b>	<b>Wautoma*</b>
<b>Dover*</b>	<b>Dunn*</b>	
<b>Maryland</b>	<b>Elizabethtown</b>	
<b>Crisfield*</b>	<b>Greenville</b>	
	<b>Hendersonville*</b>	
<b>Pennsylvania</b>	<b>Kenansville*</b>	
<b>Chambersburg*</b>	<b>Mt. Olive</b>	
<b>Gettysburg*</b>	<b>Smithfield*</b>	
	<b>Washington</b>	
<b>Virginia</b>	<b>Wilson*</b>	
<b>Onley*</b>	<b>South Carolina</b>	<b>* Denotes Bilingual Status</b>
<b>Winchester*</b>	<b>Aiken*</b>	
	<b>Beaufort*</b>	
	<b>Charleston*</b>	

REGION VI

New Mexico  
Deming\*  
Las Cruces\*

Texas  
Brownsville\*  
Canutillo  
Carrizo Springs  
Crystal City  
Del Rio  
Eagle Pass\*  
Edinburg\*  
Fabens  
Floydada  
Harlingen  
Hereford  
Laredo  
Lamesa  
McAllen\*  
Muleshoe  
Pecos  
Plainview  
Raymondville  
Rio Grande City  
Uvalde  
Weslaco\*

REGION VII

NONE

REGION VIII

Colorado  
Brighton\*  
Delta\*  
Greeley\*  
Lamar\*  
Monte Vista\*  
Rocky Ford\*

Montana  
Sidney

North Dakota  
Grafton\*

Utah  
Brigham City

REGION IX

Arizona  
Coolidge\*  
Douglas\*  
Maryvale  
Mesa  
Wilcox\*  
Yuma\*

California  
Bakersfield  
Blythe\*  
Chico  
Colusa  
Delano\*  
El Centro/Calexico\*  
Fresno (West)\*  
Gilroy\*  
Hanford\*  
Hollister\*  
Huron\*  
Indio\*  
Lakeport  
Lamont\*  
Lodi\*  
Los Banos\*  
Madera\*  
Manteca  
Marysville  
Mendota\*  
Merced\*  
Modesto  
Oakdale\*  
Oxnard\*  
Porterville\*  
Salinas/Greenfield\*  
Sanger\*  
Santa Maria  
Turlock\*  
Ukiah  
Visalia\*  
Wasco\*  
Watsonville\*  
Woodland\*

REGION X

Idaho  
Burley\*  
Canyon County\*  
Emmett\*  
Magic Valley\*  
Payette\*  
Rexburg\*

Oregon  
Hood River\*  
Madras\*  
Milton-Freewater\*  
Ontario  
Woodburn\*

Washington  
Bellingham\*  
Columbia Gorge\*  
Moses Lake\*  
Mount Vernon\*  
Okanogan\*  
Sunnyside\*  
Tri-Cities\*  
Walla Walla\*  
Wenatchee\*  
Yakima\*

\* Denotes Bilingual  
Status

Table 5

**STATES WITH HIGHEST ESTIMATED MSFW ACTIVITY**

The following are the five States with the highest year-round MSFW activity:

**California**  
**Texas**  
**Florida**  
**Washington**  
**North Carolina**

In accordance with federal regulations at 20 CFR 653.107(i), these States must assign full-time year-round staff to outreach duties. The remainder of the significant MSFW States shall make maximum efforts to hire outreach staff with MSFW experience for year-round positions and shall assign outreach staff to work full time during the period(s) of the highest activity. Such outreach staff shall be bilingual if warranted by the characteristics of the MSFW population in the State, and shall spend a majority of their time in the field.